CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXIV No. 6 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* June, 1983

COLLUSION OR CANARD?

by HUGH McNEILE

Some students of affairs, pondering upon the many strange happenings in the world, have no hesitation in attributing them to a virtually all-powerful secret world directorate, variously labelled as the Sanhedrin, the Kahal, the Learned Elders or what-have-you. Yet when they are imposed upon to name the plotters and state where they meet or what resolutions they pass, there are screams of silence. Such over-simplification in the study of world affairs can be unwise and dangerous: it has little value in persuading intelligent people to believe one's case and can lead other folk to become obsessed monomaniacs.

However, any level-headed researcher into the more arcane depths of power-politics would find it exceedingly difficult to deny that secretive internationalist bodies, like the Bilderbergers or the Trilateral Commission, *do* exist, often wielding immense influence even, at times, immense power. It is equally reasonable to suggest that many such groups (like the U.S. Council on Foreign Relations) appear. from one generation to another, to follow the same broad policies and that these policies create more mischief and wreak more havoc upon mankind than they do good. These groups are not world-government, although that may well be the goal that some are determined to pursue. The most masterly exposure of their designs, *Candour* readers need no reminding, is A. K. Chesterton's *The New Unhappy Lords*, although one presumably erudite reviewer in the decidely *anti*-democratic *National Democrat* recently implied that our founder made himself "ridiculous" by identifying the one-worlders' unity of purpose!

"Life isn't quite that simple," declared Mr. Dominic Hampshire, while adding the escape clause: "which is not to say that a lot of what Mr. Chesterton wrote wasn't true and relevant." The sources are legion on which one could draw to justify *all* that A.K. wrote, but this writer will confine himself to just one quotation, from General Smuts. It is a remark addressed to Mrs. Sarah Gertrude Millin in 1942 that she recounted in a volume of her war diaries: "After the war we shall all, I suppose, take our order from America. The war has secured the world to America. I don't say Roosevelt has deliberately cornered the world. But American big business thinks in world terms. It pursues its designs on a world scale. America is everywhere. America has everything. She maintains and she owns us."

Whose Orders?

One would have to search a long time for a more important and more revealing comment by a responsible statesman on the shaping of world affairs. It is food for thought, certainly, for those who would scoff at the notion of policies behind policies. For since it is national governments, invariably, that are on the receiving end of these policies, the identity of those who initiate them is a matter of grave concern. Whether or not F.D.R. or any subsequent president, from the lascivious Kennedy to the weakling Carter, "deliberately cornered the world" is of only marginal historical significance. They would never have secured office had there not existed between them and the dominant sections of American big business substantial agreement on the essentials of policy. The human situation is kaleidoscopic, not rigid, so such broad agreement would not preclude divergences, disagreements, even defections on so many subjects between government and big business. Also, a state of flux can exist *within* sections of the latter: the in-fighting of the New York financial wolf-packs accounted in part for the Congo infamies of 1961, do not forget. Yet the continuity of esoteric world policy over many years, whether or not it be a coincidence, is an established fact.

The most dominant and influential form of big business is high finance Here, A. K. Chesterton's oft-used "Money Power" is a very convenient and apt short-hand description for a supra-national force that has derived its strength from currency-manipulation and the lending of money throughout the world. Disentangling its motives is no easy matter. Whether economic power is pursued for the sake of political power or whether political power is sought merely to consolidate economic power remains a matter for conjecture, although the difference is very fine in that both forms of power are often inseparable. What is incontestable is that the orders which General Jan Smuts expected

America to issue have originated not from Washington (home only of the forwarding-agent!) but Wall Street.

Conservative Rhetoric

Some notion of the Money Power's intrigues may be gained from observing current events in Central America. If one is to believe a journal called the *U.S. News,* the United States is holding to a two-pronged strategy in its efforts to reduce Cuban and Russian influence. The first goal is to remove the possibility of a Communist victory in El Salvador by curtailing the Reds' flow of arms. The second is to weaken the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua by arming exile forces and neighbouring states. At the time of writing (May 10th), *The Times* reports that the latter tactic has so stung the Nicaraguans that they have complained to the U.N. that the American action constitutes "a genuine declaration of war".

But while the conservative rhetoric continues to issue from the White House, hints have been dropped of the possibility of negotiations between the seemingly implacable foes, just as rumours are heard that the Reagan administration is to insist on forming a coalition government. *Globescan,* a Paris-based newsletter, observed on February 28th that U.S. diplomats "are busily denying the move afoot in the State Department to open talks on 'power-sharing' with the leftist guerillas in El Salvador". Secretary of State Schultz — a C.F.R. man described by *Le Monde* as possessing a "passion for concensus" — has said his administration favours a "reconciliation" approach with the leftist murderers. "Expect talks to begin soon," warns *Globescan.* Where such talks invariably *end,* it omitted to state, is in a complete Communist take-over. Ask the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa!

Events look decidely less enigmatic when it is realised that the same liberal establishment that dominated the Johnson, Nixon, Ford and Carter administrations now dominates Ronald Reagan's. The Bircher *Review of the News* pointed out on March 30th that the State Department has long been under the control of the Council on Foreign Relations. 'It is by now commonplace," wrote Susan Huck, "that no-one can be the American Secretary of State unless he is first a member of the C.F.R." The election of a new "conservative" president did not make a scrap of difference because first, Americans were given the Kissinger protegé Haig to fill the Secretary's chair, and he was then followed by George Schultz, who is reckoned by our trans-atlantic colleague Don Bell to be bigger than Kissinger and Haig, being "virtually a member of the Rockefeller family".

Don Bell's considered judgement is that the plan in Central America is unaltered from President Carter's day. "In spite of its rhetoric," he writes in his newsletter* "the Reagan State Department has changed its policy very little." The U.S. is continuing to press El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras — in each of which people are fighting for their lives against communist subversion — on alleged violations of "human rights". The present situation began being planned this way, he argues, "from the time the Panama Canal was forfeited so Panama could be supplied with the funds needed to repay the interest on loans to thirty-two international banks with Eastern elitist ties." The same thing is happening in El Salvador, as powerful international bankers this time mount an assault to sacrifice the small nation to a communist regime that they believe will be stable enough to avert default on its massive loans.

Readers with a sense of *déja-vu* will recall Anthony Sampson's article in *The Observer* two years ago, quoted in this journal, in which he expressed the "dread thought" that Western bankers would feel much safer if army tanks were to suppress Solidarity's protests at cuts in its members' living standards and enforce financial discipline on the country so it could begin to repay its 24 billion dollar debt. Well, it is common knowledge that dollar-kings like David Rockefeller and Armand Hammer have *no* "dread thoughts" about dealing with Communist regimes. Rockefeller has made it known, openly, that he believes there is "greater continuity of government in socialist states than in non-socialist states."

If it *is* El Salvador's fate to be sacrificed on the altar of communism in order to avoid a default on loans that could cost Eastern bankers millions, here again one is witnessing evidence of that curious nexus between international capitalism and international communism that the more inquisitive student can trace back to Jacob Schiff and Paul Warburg's financing of the downfall of Tsarist Russia. Those chief partners of Kuhn, Loeb and Company are long dead, but the same kind of policy continues. Had Mr. Hampshire delved rather more deeply into the secret history of our times, this writer suspects he would have been much less astonished by the amazing facts it throws up.

* Don Bell edits the weekly newsletter **Don Bell Reports,** which is available from P.O. Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480, U.S.A., for 40 dollars per annum.

GANDHI – WITH HINDSIGHT

by STEPHEN REED

Wherever you look, civil disobedience is in the air. Or perhaps it would be truer to say that its proponents have their posteriors firmly planted on the ground. So what better moment could there be to polish up the fantastic legend of the little brown man who started it all and offer it for adulation by a new generation of malleable minds?

The timing of the release of the film *Gandhi* (incontestably a work of genius) is therefore as brilliant as the production itself. Signs of some master-minding here? Well . . . no less than Franklin D. Roosevelt himself always insisted that 'things don't just happen in politics; they are planned.' He knew what he was talking about. There can hardly be a person over the age of seven unmoved by the deluge of 'clips', interviews, critiques and emotional award-galas relating to the new film. ('Deluge' must surely be the apt word for so massive a brainwash.) By the time they see the complete film, millions will have been persuaded that a soul of the whitest radiance once walked this earth in the guise of a scrawny, seminude figure who embodied the highly incongruous qualities of lawyer, politician and saint.

Reverse Of The Legend

While there is no gainsaying the man's towering spiritual stature, it is nevertheless possible to hold an opinion about him that is the reverse of the popular legend. Mohandas Karachand Gandhi was an exceedingly fallible mortal who preached an altogether erroneous doctrine. His assassination was a tragic illustration of that personal fallibility and doctrinal error. He was a fraudulent 'saint' and preposterous 'hero'. His tedious theme was that the Indian masses were held down by an oppressive British administration backed by overwhelming military might.

At the height of his agitations, the entire strength of British manpower in India (men, women and children) did not reach 70,000. The Army accounted for about 60,000; there were some 3,500 Civil Servants and around 4,000 policemen. Between them, they controlled nearly 250 million Indians, harshly divided (not by the British) into various degrees of caste — compared with which South Africa's apartheid has all the rigidity of a marshmallow.

Before the days of the British Raj, India was either a chaos of small wars and brigandage or the flaccid subject of cruel foreign rule. Among the 'outrages' inflicted by the British upon a powerless Indian populace were the eradication of Thuggee (banditry), the abolition of Suttee (burning of widows) and female infanticide (universal until 1874), and the relentless imposition of posts, telegraphs, railways, irrigation systems and grain camps (yes, they were called *concentration* camps!).

In the days of their freedom, the people were in the hands of their native doctors, known as hakims or vaids, who were approximately on a level with European medical practitioners of the 13th century. The British set up the Indian Medical Service and saved countless lives by vaccination and the prevention of plague and cholera. For the first time, women were sent into the zenanas to treat patients whom the laws of purdah prevented from being attended by male doctors.

Gandhi also told his followers that once the British had been ejected, human misery would be banished for ever and India would pulsate, from one end to the other, with radiant happiness. Such speeches are on record. If he truly believed such claptrap, he was mad; if he did not believe it . . . When challenged with the British record, he invariably took refuge in the deceitful evasion: 'Good government is no substitute for self-government.'

He was a preacher of non-violence (*satyagraha*) who lacked the wit to see that the only end to his doctrine would be violence on a massive scale. He posed as the advocate of handicrafts and the simple life. In speech after speech he rejected the dynamism of Western civilisation and claimed he sought to insulate the distinctive Eastern values against it. It is starkly incomprehensible that a mind in good working order should try to create that insulation by importing from the West the great dynamic of modern nationalism. No sooner was his great objective achieved — the transfer of power from British hands — than the lid blew off the Hindu-Moslem magazine. Scores of thousands of men, women and children were butchered and millions were made homeless. Gandhi's contribution to the re-establishment of law and order was a series of fasts unto death' (without dying).

A charitable view of the man could be that he truly believed the means could shape the end. He thus fell into the cardinal error of supposing that the constantly shifting kaleidoscope of human affairs will ever allow a political end to be precisely predetermined or thereafter permanently fixed. He was not, and is not, alone in such delusion. His passive resistance ignored the fact that there are always some beings who are less passive than others. However great his influence, no man can rationally hope, when conducting a large campaign involving millions of people, to lay down a valid line between what is permissable and impermissible in civil disobedience.

Gandhi's confidence in his own powers to allay the cruel disorders his policies created was seen to be most tragically misplaced.

There is no intention here to insult the memory of a most remarkable human being. On the contrary. It is willingly acknowledged that during the South African and First World Wars Gandhi displayed outstanding courage and devotion working under fire in ambulance corps. In the Kaiser's War, indeed, he even conducted a recruiting campaign in Bombay. Physical courage is admirable and Gandhi possessed it in abundance. Intellectual courage is a much rarer trait; sadly, there is little evidence of it in his character. If human affairs are ever to be sanely conducted it is first essential that at least a few people should endeavour to distinguish the true from the false, and examine both leaders and policies as far as possible without the discolouration of emotion.

Gandhi was one of those rare beings whose personality creates what can only be called a vast magnetnc field. It is, unfortunately, not a synonym for wisdom, or even adequacy. Before it is too late, we must learn to listen to our heads rather than to our hearts; to inspect with considerable sceptism the personae of those who aspire to be our Pied Pipers.

CHURCHILL'S WANTON BARBARISM

In our time whole episodes of history, frequently of tremendous significance and matters of established fact, are calmly jettisoned or reversed should the truth prove inexpedient or embarrassing. To *Candour* readers, the examples of truth about Pearl Harbour and of the origins of Communism in Russia will come readily to mind; other instances of the suppression or major distortion of history abound.

The difficulty lies essentially in the publicising of the facts elicited — the determined student of history has no insurmountable problem in their discovery — for intuition tells one that the heavy hand of the censor lies upon all channels of communication. It is in this field that Michael McLaughlin has performed a valuable service in presenting in magazine format* a lucid and accurate account of the abominable war crime prepetrated by Winston Churchill in the summer of 1943 when he ordered the reduction to rubble of more than 6,000 acres of Hamburg.

The method devised for Hamburg's total destruction was simple and extremely effective. The first waves of bombers released thousands of high-explosive bombs on the city which kept the population and especially the fire service in their shelters. Subsequent raids rained down magnesium bombs. It is conservatively estimated that between July 24th and August 3rd. Hamburg was struck down by 1,200 landmines, 30,000 heavy high-explosive bombs and 3,000,000 stick incendiary bombs. In addition, 80,000 100-pound phospherous bombs were dropped on its inhabitants with, as Mr. McLaughlin vividly relates, macabre effects.

"The exploding phosphorous bombs," he writes, "sprayed their contents indiscriminately and clothing caught fire and had to be torn from the body, otherwise the wearer would suffer terrible nightmarish burns. When the liquid spattered onto people's hair, the victim was doomed . . . The chemical globules, like a burning jelly, burned fiercely, setting aflame the entire head." The terrified and frenzied victims could be left only to writhe in agony, for this was no ordinary fire that could be smothered — phosphorous continues to burn and sets alight any material thrown over it. Others who were near the River Alster dashed madly to the water, trailing tongues of flaming smoke and fire. But there they were faced with a choice that stunned the mind in its horror:

"Water prevents phosphorous jelly from burning because it denies the chemical the one thing it needs to burn: oxygen . . . But many had the jelly on their faces and heads. Certainly the spluttering fiery chemicals went out as the victims ducked their heads beneath the water, but the moment they brought their heads up again to break the surface and take a breath of air, the phosphorous burst into flames again." Such was the victims' dilemma: death by drowning or death by burning.

During the ten horrific days of Hamburg's devastation, an estimated 100,000 civilians lost their lives. Their screams of agony, the howling of the fire-storms, the clattering explosions of bombs surpassed any representation of Hell as imagined by the most inspired of artists. By ordering the raids for the purpose of terrorising an enemy civilian population, Winston Churchill overturned rules of war that had endured for more than thousand years of European history. The reader of Michael McLaughlin's booklet becomes convinced by the last page that the criteria at Nuremberg for German guilt rested solely on the fact that they had fought on the losing side.

* **Death Of A City** by Michael McLaughlin is available. price £1, from Historical Review Press, 19A Madiera Place, Brighton, Sussex BN2 1TN.

LIGHTS OUT

Shall we give an Oscar
To Attenborough sahib?
He, so quite unsuited
To wear the Gandhi garb;
The evening-dress a far-cry
From simple shepherd shawl
And poverty as distant
As Everest is tall.

An Oscar for the unctuous
Apartheid excuse,
To curry certain favour
And gold from Asian goose;
The statuette repeated
For instant somersault
From direction Jo'burg
To racialistic halt!

The premiere to chasten
Separate development,
Celluloid invitation
For ethnic discontent;
Oscars by the armful
And boodle in the bank,
And anarchy, and mugging,
And multi-racial prank.

But, alas, no Oscar
For passive resistance,
Sir Richard must be wary —
His eye on the main chance!
Action! Sound and Music!
Astute to know the score,
Sub-continental filmer,
U-turn Attenborough.

B. E. BIGGS.

BOOKS FROM FOREST HOUSE

Open Sesame *by B. E. Biggs.*

An anthology of poems of B. E. Biggs that have been published in *Candour* over the past thirteen years. Read them for apt comment on our times **£1.00.**

Facing The Abyss *by A. K. Chesterton*

An analysis of the disastrous effects of liberalism on the national and racial identity of the British people **£1.00.**

COMPENDIUM OF TERROR

The unvarying terrorist defence that engaging in assassination, bombing, plundering and bombing against the law-abiding majority is the only available method of "liberating" the people from their "oppression" (i.e. the lawful government) is a line we are well used to hearing from I.R.A. spokesmen, by courtesy of *Panorama* or Mr. Isaacs' Channel Four. The realities for Ulstermen (Protestant and Catholic alike) of Republican "liberation" are clearly set out in a 24-page pamphlet of photographs* compiled by the Democratic Unionist M.P., Peter Robinson. Dedicated to the memory of his schoolday-chum, Harry Beggs, who was blasted to bits by an I.R.A. bomb in 1971, it graphically records the day to day suffering endured by Ulster's population.

Two instances are sufficient to illustrate how damnable is the terrorists' trade. On page seven is a picture emphasising the ruthlessly indiscriminate choice that the Republicans make of their victims. The body of *seven month old* Colin Nicholl is shown being carried from the rubble of a furniture showroom in the Shankill Road that bombers demolished. A two year old girl and two adults died with baby Colin. Then a couple of pages on, a Mr. Ross Hearst is pictured at the funeral of his daughter Anne, who served in the Ulster Defence Regiment. Three years later, the mourner became a victim himself of I.R.A. bestiality. Mr. Hearst's bullet-riddled body is seen in a South Armagh ditch close to the burnt-out car in which he had been driving.

These tragic events speak for themselves. Yet when will the feeble-spirited British public make any move to force an end to Government vacillation in the face of I.R.A terror? If atrocities against our kinsfolk in Ulster are too far away to alert people's minds to the revolution at work, then surely the storm signals here on the mainland, such as the carnage in Hyde Park last summer, are plain enough to see. The Government must order the speedy physical extermination of the I.R.A. by any necessary means. But in the absence of any extraordinary move to apply public pressure, the experience of Cyprus or Kenya suggests we can expect the inevitable effort to surrender Northern Ireland's destiny to the gunmen. That is why Mr. Robinson's booklet should be placed in the hands of as wide a readership as possible.

* **Savagery And Suffering** by Peter Robinson, M.P., is available, price 55p., from the Democratic Unionist Party, 296 Albertbridge Road, Belfast BT5 4GX

UNENDED BATTLE (Part V) by HUGH McNEILE

ON TOUR IN AFRICA

An issue on which the League of Empire Loyalists campaigned with recurring passion in the late-1950s and early '60s was the surrender of our colonial possessions in Africa to Black rule. Since the time of the first steps towards de-colonisation in West Africa, the League dismissed the cliché of "African nationalism" as having little basis in reality, all too often comprising movements within colonial territories that were designed to undermine tribal and native authority and secure personal power and prestige for a handful of slick African loud-mouths and demagogues. They managed to sustain the illusion of a general ferment on the part of the native population by playing on grievances, genuine or manufactured, and could depend on the support of left-wing British politicians who were hungry to espouse any anti-British causes that came to hand.

Events in Africa occupied much of A. K. Chesterton's attention and interest. An old Africa hand himself, who had developed an intimate knowledge of the continent and its peoples over many years, he recognised that left to themselves the ordinary Africans possessed precious little craving for politics or self-government or independence. Such ideas, he wrote in *Candour* in 1956, meant "as little to their minds as does the Quantum Theory to the minds of monkeys." The comment was not meant to be pejorative — it was intended as a stark reminder to Whites that they had established themselves in Africa by virtue of the natives' instinctive acceptance of their leadership and that the security of the European minorities depended on their continuing will to govern. To bend before the "wind of change" that Harold Macmillan alleged was blowing across the continent and deprive Africa of the skills, courage and initiative of the White man would leave it in a shambles. The countless reports that have appeared of corruption, despotism and butchery in almost every African state that has become independent over the last twenty-five years have vindicated A.K.'s prophecy beyond any possibility of dispute. Yet how many people at the time were prepared to heed his warnings of what would result from the "reeking, run-to-seed liberalism . . . the mysterious and quite fantastic collapse of European morale" in our colonial possessions?

A.K. carried the League's message into British Africa a number of times, latterly making a virtue out of the necessity of having to winter in South Africa because of his tendency to suffer severe bouts of bronchitis. His most successful tour was in June and July of 1957. Southern Rhodesian Loyalists (the I.E.L. was an Empire-wide movement, establishing branches as far afield as Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Canada) raised the cost of the tour so that A.K. and Leslie Greene could have the opportunity to explain personally the League's aims and work to settlers in Kenya and the Central African Federation. He was received in Salisbury as a V.I.P., being accorded long interviews and meetings with the Federation's Acting Governor, Southern Rhodesia's Governor and the Mayor of Salisbury. Seven public meetings were addressed at which A.K. attacked the sinister American influences that were threatening to undermine the Empire and appealed for settlers to give the League their wholehearted support.

Rout Of The Capricornists

By far the liveliest activity was the debate with Colonel David Stirling of the multi-racialist Capricorn Africa Society. Nearly five hundred people of all races crammed every available seat, perched on window ledges and jammed in doorways of Salisbury's Cathedral Hall to hear A.K. and Leslie argue the motion that 'the ideas of the Capricorn Africa Society, if adopted, would mean the ruination of British Africa".

A.K. opened his argument by exposing the false premise on which the Capricorn case rested, viz. that all that separated the African from the European was the colour of his skin. Europeans and Africans, he suggested, 'have followed totally different lines of development because of inherently different psychological patterns." Colonel Stirling was told that his call for legislation to enable the African to out-vote the European displayed "a lamentable ignorance" of the African and "an even greater ignorance of the nature of power". Did he not know that but for the arrival of the British in East Africa the Masai would long ago have put paid to the Kikuyu? Was he not aware that Livingstone had described Nyasaland as a charnel-house? The Capricornists, in effect, were calling for British Africa "to revert to barbarism".

Not long before A.K.'s arrival in Africa, Colonel Stirling had uttered the outrageous view that what Africa needed was for the British way of life to be smashed in order that a new way of life could be built in which the Black and the Asian might participate. For this there were calls for his deportation. A.K. let the matter rest at challenging Stirling to state exactly what the African contribution would

be. "Let him gather together African research-workers and African scientists and African mathematicians and African engineers, if any of them exist, to build African atomic power-plants . . . Give Africans the formulae and let them produce an all-African turbo-jet plane." Should they do so, A.K. ventured to advise Stirling, he would do well not to be a passenger on the trial flight!

A.K. concluded his speech with the charge that the Capricornists were attempting to bring foreign finance and influence to bear upon Rhodesian problems. Apparently, Stirling had been involved in Washington and New York in what had been reported as "top-level" discussions with Government officials and influential business men, including the master-usurer Bernard Baruch. Some members of the audience, A.K. warned, might simply regard the Capricorn Society, by virtue of its name, as "a very giddy goat." Colonel Stirling would have been more honest to give it the name Cancer, for Rhodesians would be better placed if they treated it as "a cancer which will destroy you unless you first destroy it". Having heard Stirling and his African seconder speak (the latter experienced problems in distinguishing between a nuclear power-station and an H-bomb!), the audience upheld A.K.'s motion by 278 votes to 191. The result was greeted with wild enthusiasm.

Not surprisingly, an L.E.L. branch was quickly formed in Salisbury, as was another in Lusaka when A.K. and Leslie visited Northern Rhodesia. But it was in Kenya where they received their warmest reception. Between five and six hundred whites attended the League meeting in Nairobi and at others in the colony the audiences were reported as joining the movement "en bloc". Eight new branches were created and Major Peter Roberts, Chairman of Kenya's Federal Independence Party, became the colony's Loyalist leader. A.K. attributed the enthusiasts' overwhelming response to their being "no sucklers of the welfare state". Their initiative arose from their dependence for their livelihood on their own skills, courage and powers of leadership. A less robust attitude was encountered among English-speaking South Africans during A.K.'s subsequent travels in the south of the continent. Only three League branches were formed, in Transvaal, Natal and the Cape.

The successes in Central Africa were short-lived, however. Within a year, Major Roberts incurred A.K.'s wrath in the columns of *Candour* for toying with acceptance of a multi-racial constitution for Kenya. Further sharp criticism was aimed at him when he supported in 1960 the opening to Africans of the White Highlands, which led to Roberts' departure from the League. The Kenyan branches of the League, in fact, seem to have thrived for only a year or so, for in July 1958 A.K. was already lamenting the lack of a "countrywide European resistance movement" to fight increasingly vociferous Black demands for majority rule. A "lack of local enterprise and grip" and a "willingness to compromise" had paralysed the growth of the League and its only prospect for survival lay in securing new leaders with a "better conception of the futility and peril of compromise." History was to repeat itself in the self-inflicted emasculation of the right-wing in Rhodesia a decade and a half later, the disastrous consequences of which greet our eyes on television screens and in newspapers today.

Stop Immigration!

Another aspect of the racial question was coloured immigration in Britain. The League increasingly turned its attention on the issue from 1958, although *Candour* had, from its founding, commented adversely on various features of the West Indian migration, such as the exploitation of White tenants by Black landlords, the illicit drug traffic and the high incidence of certain diseases. The root of the objection to immigration, however, was the genetic consequences of sexual relationships across the colour bar. The only answer, declared *Candour* on October 3rd, 1958, was to stop immigration and "repatriate those who abuse their hospitality or become parasites of the Welfare State." A new statement of principles approved at the League's 1963 Annual General Meeting called for repatriation "in large numbers." Despite this strong stand, it was always A. K. Chesterton's policy that the movement should steer clear of the kind of street-level agitation engaged in by groups like Mosley's Union Movement or the various schismatic off-shoots from the League led by Colin Jordan, John Bean and John Tyndall. When the Notting Hill race riots broke out in the autumn of 1958, Loyalists were instructed to avoid the area and concentrate on bringing pressure to bear on the Westminster politicians to halt immigration. When, on separate occasions, the publishers Anthony Blond, Canon John Collins and the *Sheffield Star* newspaper suggested the League involved itself in the incitement of racial hatred, A.K. successfully took legal action against them.

Next issue: **"The Battle of Blackandbluepool"**

A. K. SPEAKS

A C.60 cassette tape of A. K. Chesterton speaking on the menace of International Finance.

Introduced by Leslie Greene.

PRICE £3.00 (£5.00 OVERSEAS)

Candour Publishhding Company,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

53, Greencroft Towers,
Felling, Gateshead 10.

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS

Celluloid Guru

For a motion picture that purports to be a biography, I must say that the appalling *Gandhi* does tend to gloss over the more awkward aspects of the crafty Gujarati lawyer's life. Take his *brahmacharaya* experiments, in which he bedded down innumerable naked young ladies all night long in an endeavour to test his will to abstain from intercourse. I bet the filmic possibilities of that episode in the loinclothed lecher's life would have made Attenborough's epic even more of a box office hit! Yet no mention was made of it. The Indian novelist, Salman Rushdie, commented in *The Times* that Dicky's essay in deification also omitted the little gargoyle's fondness for Indian billionaire industrialists — he finally keeled over in the house of the wealthiest of them in Delhi. "Surely this is a rich area for a biographer to mine," wrote Rushdie, "the man of the masses, dedicated to the simple life, self-denial, asceticism, who was financed all his life by super-capitalist patrons?" If the incredibly expensive *Gandhi's* potrayal of its subject is selective, to put it charitably, is there any reason to repose any faith in its account of the British record in India?

Be Prepared For Perverts

The Inner London Education Authority's festering squabble with the Boy Scout movement has erupted again over the extreme Left-wing committee's decision not to make any further cash grants until it has satisfied itself that local scout groups are "free of sexism, racism or any other kind of discrimination". Well, why *not* have girls in the Scouts — a few *Black* beauties, at that. And, conversely, the sight of some Rasta boys lolloping along in their Brownie uniforms would brighten up the dullest church parade! Laughing matters aside, the threat implicit in I.L.E.A.'s superficially half-baked ultimatum is that no money would be forth coming if any attempt were made to refuse a job with the scouts to a homo — a pathetic breed for whom scoutmasters' jobs hold almost as much magnetic attraction in their attempts to gain converts as do benefices in the Church of England! Already, the lunatics who run the Greater London Council are actively encouraging poofters to apply for positions which involve working with children and young people for the spurious reason that the latter would benefit from increased contacts with "gay men". I hope the Scouts have sense enough to tell the "educationalists" who administer inner London to take a running jump, and raise whatever money they need by other means.

Clerical Comradeship

The Left-wing partisanship of the Churches (and the "B."B.C.) becomes daily more apparent. In April, according to one of our informants, Radio Four's early morning *Thought For The Day* featured a Methodist minister praising the name of Fidel Castro of all people, while no mention at all was made of Christ! He took a swing, too, at the West for its "over-spending" on military hardware without the slightest word about the greater spending of the Soviets on their gigantic war machine. In all likelihood, it did not even enter the cleric's mind that his poisonous comments were a gross abuse of the opportunity to give a religious broadcast. Such figures are all too thick on the ground in the Churches today and their strange compulsion for espousing subversive views is possibly the greatest impediment to the survival of Christianity in the years ahead.

ADDITIONS TO THE SAUCE

Having read "Sauce For the Gandhi" in last month's *Candour*, an eminently perspicacious friend told me that I was obviously aiming at popu-parity with Enoch Powell! It seems the penultimate paragraph was too obscure for my discerning critic. Therefore, I hereby amplify: between the years 1913 and 1935, the offices of Lord Chief Justice of England and later Viceroy of India were occupied by Rufus Isaacs, 1st Marquis of Reading, and the position of High Commissioner to Palestine was attained by Herbert Samuel, 1st Viscount. During their time, Edwin Samuel Montague, second son of the 1st Lord Swaythling, presided at the India Office. Abraham Isaac was the Reading/Montague choice for Chief Judge in Bombay, whilst Reuben Benjamin* was administrator of the Indian State of Chuda. As someone has said before me, whatever these proconsuls and such appeared to Englishmen, to Indians and Arabs they were unmistakably Jews. So what price the *British* Raj? On the same hand, when we look at the latest Viceroys of the Earth, if that is what they are, we must say: what price British, Indian or any other national independence?

**The only one not recognised in Britannica.*

ROSINE de BOUNEVIALLE.

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.